

earn less on the dollar as to other women. Without Social Security, 61 percent of Latinas over the age of 65 would live below the poverty line. Social Security has been the most successful anti-poverty program perhaps ever to be undertaken. According to a report released today by the National Women's Law Center, the typical widow receives a benefit of \$865 per month. I am frightened to think that Republicans want to strip women of their earned benefits simply because they live longer.

Without Social Security benefits, the poverty rate for unmarried women would be about 60 percent instead of the current 16 percent! But under the leading Republican privatization plan, the benefit would be only \$476 per month. This amount is equal to only 65 percent of the poverty line! Women account for 70 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries older than 85. Women still earn less than men—73 cents to the dollar—and minority women face even larger disparities in wages.

Privatization means that women who are on the edge of poverty living in my district would be at the mercy of an unpredictable stock market. Without guaranteed benefits, these women would be forced to live day-to-day, just trying to put food on the table. These women would lose the "security" from Social Security! Democrats believe that all American workers should get the benefits they paid for.

We want to save, strengthen, and secure Social Security for the future generations. Our senior citizens and future generations should not be guinea pigs for a political experiment. Just like the non-existent weapons of mass destruction—you have been told a scary story by the Republican majority and President Bush. Let me assure you—Social Security is not in a crisis. Democrats will fight to protect your earned benefits.

ORANGE COUNTY GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT SYSTEM

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to support the Orange County Groundwater Replenishment System. This bill is identical to the one I introduced in the 108th Congress as H.R. 1156, which passed the House by voice vote under Suspension of the rules last year.

The bill would increase the authorized Federal share for the Orange County California Groundwater Replenishment (OCGWR) System from \$20 million to \$80 million. This will allow Orange County to complete this important and much-needed project, which will serve about 2.3 million residents of north and central Orange County, and it will create a new water supply of 72,000 acre-feet per year.

The OCGWR project is not just important to Orange County, California, but also to the entire western United States. By recycling our own water, we in Orange County would not have to rely so heavily on water from the Colorado River Aqueduct or the San Francisco Bay Delta.

Moreover, the OCGWR is a highly innovative recycling project—a pilot project for other future water recycling projects. Experts in pub-

lic water management systems, from other States and from countries from around the world, have come to Orange County to look at the tertiary cleaning system that we have. The project is of national and even international significance.

This is a straightforward and reasonable bill. Its passage would simply bring the Federal share of funding closer to 25 percent, the level at which almost every other reclamation project is funded under Federal water reclamation and conservation programs.

This project, and this legislation, has received strong support from Members on both sides of the aisle. As I mentioned previously, the Committee on Resources very generously allowed this same bill to be considered under Suspension of the Rules last year. I would like to take this opportunity to again thank Chairman POMBO from California, Ranking Member RAHALL from West Virginia, as well as former Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member NAPOLITANO of California for their overwhelming support of this bill.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from Orange County for their continued support. Mr. MILLER, Mr. COX, Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. ROYCE are strong supporters of this project. Securing funding for the OCGWR has always been, and will continue to be, a bipartisan effort.

Lastly, let me thank Orange County Water District President Phil Anthony, former OCWD Board Chair Denis Bilodeau, and General Manager Virginia Grebbien for their hard work and leadership in groundwater recycling. Their innovation has put Orange County in the forefront of water recycling and groundwater replenishment technology.

I look forward to working on passing this legislation with all of my colleagues, and I thank them again for their continued support.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE ORAL HEALTH PROMOTION ACT

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce today the reintroduction of the Oral Health Promotion Act, a bill I previously sponsored in the 107th Congress. I will reintroduce this bill tomorrow and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me as original cosponsors on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, oral health care in the United States is in a sad state of decay. Congress cannot neglect it any longer. While the number of Americans without private health insurance of any kind is staggering enough at over 45 million, the number of Americans without private or public dental insurance is more than two times that figure. One hundred and eight million Americans—at last count—had no dental insurance at all: no coverage for emergency services, no coverage for fillings, no coverage for braces, no coverage for check-ups. Amazingly, despite great advances in oral health sciences, the Surgeon General has reported that tooth decay has become the single most common chronic childhood disease—five times more common than asthma and seven times more common than hay fever.

What does our neglect of oral health cost us? Surveys have shown that dental problems

cause children to miss more than 51 million hours of school and adults to miss more than 164 million hours of work each year. That's a lot of lost education, lost productivity and lost pay. And let's be clear—lack of access to dental care does not strike evenly across the socioeconomic spectrum. According to the U.S. Surgeon General:

Poor children suffer twice as many cavities as their more affluent peers, and their disease is more likely to be untreated.

Poor children suffer nearly 12 times more restricted-activity school days than children from higher-income families. (In my own state, which is doing a lot better than the national average on many oral healthcare indicators, a recent study found that 23 percent of children in grades 1–3 experienced 82 percent of all decay found.)

Medicaid has not been able to fill the gap in providing dental care to poor children: Fewer than one in five Medicaid-covered children received a single dental visit in a recent year-long study period.

For each child without medical insurance, there are at least 2.6 children without dental insurance.

For every adult 19 years or older with medical insurance, there are three without dental insurance.

Obviously, there are a lot of factors at play in this problem. But when it comes down to what we can do to increase access to dental care for the largest number of people, the solution, I think, already exists. While many other dental providers close the door to Medicaid and uninsured patients, often because they do not receive adequate reimbursement for the services they provide, Federally Qualified Community Health Centers provided dental services to millions and millions of them last year. Currently, over 1,000 community, migrant, and homeless health centers serve over 15 million people in 3,600 urban and rural communities in every State and territory.

It is clear that focusing on expansion of the dental care infrastructure through these and similar community-based providers will get us the biggest bang for our buck. Community health centers—which serve all patients in their communities regardless of their ability to pay—are on the front lines of getting dental care to those who are least likely to get it, namely those on Medicaid and those with no insurance at all. A lot of praise has been showered on this successful program for many years and from both sides of the aisle, including from President Bush, and rightly so. Now I think we really need to put our money where our mouths are and fund the creation of more dental care infrastructure based on the community health care model.

That is why I am introducing the "Oral Health Promotion Act" to address our national crisis in access to dental care. This bill will make a serious commitment to developing a dental health care infrastructure across our country and expand access to high-quality, affordable dental and health care for all Americans. It will:

(1) Create a \$140 million fund for the workforce, capital and equipment needed to establish or expand oral health services at community health centers, school-based dental centers (and other community-based sites) across the country;

(2) Provide states with an enhanced federal match (FMAP) for agreeing to cover full adult dental benefits under the Medicaid program;

(3) Require that State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) coverage include dental benefits for children;

(4) Authorize and provide additional funding for states to provide dental services under SCHIP as a supplement to other health coverage;

(5) Create incentives for states to pay market-based reimbursement for dental services under SCHIP and Medicaid and to cover the Medicaid level of dental benefits under SCHIP.

I urge my colleagues to join me as original cosponsors of this important legislation, which I will introduce tomorrow.

INAUGURAL LIGHTING OF THE
CITY OF LOS ANGELES' OFFICIAL
WELCOMING MONUMENT,
THE VINCENT THOMAS BRIDGE

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise ask for unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Last Sunday, January 30, it was my pleasure to join with Los Angeles Mayor Jim Hahn, Council members Janice Hahn and Tom LaBong, State Senator Alan Lowenthal, the widow and family of the late California Assemblyman Vincent Thomas and the citizens of Los Angeles for the Inaugural Lighting of the Official Welcoming Monument for the City of Los Angeles—the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

In this time of inaugurations, it is fitting to recognize the bridge that is an integral link to one of this Nation's most active ports and that will serve as a guiding light for economic growth to our city, our State and our country.

Los Angeles is a world-class city and it is the primary point of entry into the United States for people and commerce throughout the Pacific Rim. In fact, many consider Los Angeles to be the capital of the Pacific Rim.

The Vincent Thomas Bridge represents the Gateway into the United States and I can think of no greater monument to our world-class city and to the great people of Los Angeles and the southern California region.

Sunday's event was the culmination of the collective efforts of a broad section of Los Angelinos over the last 16 years. This monument will serve as a beacon for California, the Nation and the World as to all that is good and great about Los Angeles.

I want to take this time to congratulate the members of the Vincent Thomas Bridge Lighting Committee of San Pedro and their President, Louis Dominguez for the hard work they have done to help make today happen.

Their efforts in raising the \$1,002,657 necessary to realize this project are to be commended. I would also like to thank the Port of Los Angeles and the Department of Water and Power for their major funding of this project.

Nestled in the San Pedro and Wilmington communities, the 41-year-old Vincent Thomas Bridge is named for the late State assemblyman who 50 years ago led the fight in the California legislature to build the bridge. Today it is a vital transportation link for the Port of Los Angeles.

But the Vincent Thomas Bridge also brings regional economic forces that have a profound

impact on our regional and national economies.

As the southern California region continues to grow, so does the significance of the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

The Vincent Thomas Bridge connects the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, creating the largest port complex in the country and third largest in the world. Together, these ports are responsible for upwards of 45 percent of the containerized cargo that enter our country. In addition, approximately 80 percent of the goods that come into this country from the Pacific Rim come through these two ports.

These ports are true economic engines.

In 2002, the annual value of the trade handled by Southern California's two ports was \$172 billion. It is estimated that in 2010 that number will grow to \$253 billion a year.

In 2002, trade through southern California ports supported over 3.7 million jobs nationwide.

As a Senior Member on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in Washington, I can tell you that I too have fought to make sure that the Nation knows the importance of our bridges, highways and ports in Los Angeles County to the economic well being of our country.

The goods that move through the southern California ports impact us all, some States more than others.

For example, annually \$16 billion worth of goods move through our ports to New York, that is \$7.8 billion a month. Illinois receives \$12 billion a year and \$1 billion a month in goods from southern California. And Texas receives \$11.8 billion a year or \$983 million a month.

I could go on, but instead would like to extend a standing invitation to my colleagues to visit this bridge and to visit our ports here in Los Angeles and Long Beach so that they too can get a first hand look at one of the major economic engines that helps drive our national economy.

THE NEXT STEP IN IRAQ IS AN
EXIT STRATEGY

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 2005

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, millions of average Iraqis defied the threats of violence and took a courageous first step toward democracy and self-governance. The images of Iraqis voting for the first time were truly uplifting. But before this Administration declares "Mission Accomplished" all over again, we cannot ignore the challenges that remain. We cannot simply hope that the elections will make the insurgency go away, or put an end to the violence. For too long, our entire strategy in Iraq has been based on waiting and hoping. Now more than ever, we need a real strategy to make Iraq stable and self-sufficient and bring our troops home.

President Bush came into office with clear ideas about when we use our military power and put our forces in harm's way. Five years ago, when he was running for President, Governor George W. Bush criticized President Clinton for not having an exit strategy in Kosovo. This is what he said: "Victory means

exit strategy, and it's important for the President to explain to us what the exit strategy is." Two years ago, President Bush sent our armed forces into Iraq without a plan to win the peace. We had no exit strategy and therefore no victory strategy.

Two years later, we still don't. The elections are a step forward in a long process of making Iraq politically independent. But the elections don't change the fact that Iraq is still not secure. The 150,000 American troops in Iraq are no less at risk than they were last week, which sadly was one of the most tragic weeks of the war. Despite the election, the reality on the ground is unchanged—security in Iraq is not getting better—it's been getting steadily worse since the summer of 2003. The occupation is not making Iraq secure—it's only fueling the violence.

The Bush Administration has no endgame in sight. Their only strategy is to hope that security will get better. But it didn't get better after we captured Saddam, after we transferred sovereignty, or after we went into Fallujah. We can hope, but we can't plan on security improving now that Iraq has had elections. We can't count on security in Iraq getting any better as long as the United States has 150,000 troops in Iraq, and as long as we are viewed as an occupying power. That's why we need an exit strategy that includes a timetable for a U.S. withdrawal. It's the only way to change the dynamic on the ground.

A new Zogby poll in Iraq that found that 65 percent of Iraqis want us to leave, including 68 percent of Shiites and 80 percent of Sunnis. We need to recognize that the presence of 150,000 U.S. forces on Iraqi soil is fueling the insurgency. Over the last year, we've sent more troops to Iraq, but the insurgency has only gotten stronger, more sophisticated, and more deadly. We're creating more insurgents than we're neutralizing. We've killed or captured more than 1,000–3,000 insurgents every month for more than a year. But the insurgency has quadrupled in size, from at least 5,000 to at least 20,000. The Iraqi Intelligence Minister estimates that there are 200,000 Iraqis who are providing support for the insurgents.

Iraqis who voted on Sunday rejected the anti-democratic, terrorist ideology of Zarqawi. But for the most part, the insurgency in Iraq is not comprised of foreign terrorists or high-ranking Baathists. More than 95 percent of the detainees we have in Iraq are Iraqis, and more than 95 percent of those captured in the strike on Fallujah. Only a handful of the Baathists on the most-wanted list are still at large.

To have any chance of success in Iraq we need to understand whom we're fighting against. The insurgency is not comprised of any one group, and they don't subscribe to any one ideology. They are united only by their opposition to the occupation. And they are receiving support from pockets of the Iraqi civilian population that have become embittered with the occupation.

The open-endedness of the occupation also threatens to undermine the credibility of the moderate Iraqi leaders who are seen working with us. Most of the main political slates ran on the platform that they would be best suited to remove U.S. forces from Iraq. It can't happen today. But as the President of Iraq, Ghazi al-Yawar, said today, the U.S. can remove some troops over the course of this year. It's